

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL AND HEALTH COMMISSION OF
THE VILLAGE OF NORTH BARRINGTON, WHICH WAS HELD
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2012 AT
THE NORTH BARRINGTON VILLAGE HALL
111 OLD BARRINGTON ROAD IN SAID VILLAGE**

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

At 7:31 P.M. Chairman Bruce Kramper called the meeting to order and the Deputy Village Clerk called the roll:

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Present in Person: | Chairman Bruce Kramper, Vice Chairman Patty Kalinowski, Jackie Andrew |
| Absent: | Rob Haas |
| Also Present: | Nancy Schumm, Schumm Consulting LLC Susan Allman, Village Forester Pete Boland, Village Trustee Albert Pino, Village President Charlie Keppel, Care of Trees Irma Terry, Davey Resources Nicky Obenauf, Davey Resources Doug DeWitt, Tallgrass Restoration Marcy Barrett, Front Range Environmental Kara DeGraff, Integrated Lakes Management Kim Blaszczyk, Integrated Lakes Management Jonathan Koepke, ENcap Tom Foster, V-3 Keith Jones, V-3 Josh LaPointe, Applied Ecological Services Chuck Campbell, Applied Ecological Services Nicole Keiter, Deputy Village Clerk |

**2. Approval of Past Minutes: Environmental and Health Commission “Special” Meeting
October 9, 2012**

The Minutes of the October 9, 2012 Environmental and Health Commission “Special” Meeting were made available to the Commission.

Motion: Vice Chairman Patty Kalinowski moved that the Minutes of the October 9, 2012 Environmental and Health Commission “Special” Meeting be approved; seconded by Jackie Andrew.

Discussion: There was some discussion.

Vote on Motion: The voice vote was unanimous in favor.

Chairman Bruce Kramper declared the Minutes of the October 9, 2012 Environmental and Health Commission “Special” Meeting approved as written, and put on file.

3. Flint Creek Project: Review of RFP's, Nancy Schumm

Nancy Schumm, Schumm Consulting LLC, lead with a brief introduction regarding the process that the presentations would follow. Ms. Schumm stated that each contractor would be allotted ten minutes for their presentations. Any questions from the Commission would be included in these ten minutes. She stated that there were seventeen requests for project plans and seven submittals. A representative from each of the seven submitting companies will be present for their presentation time. Ms. Schumm also stated that there are four different project components that the companies could present a proposal for; some companies will present for all four components while others may only be submitting for a few of the components. The four components are Tree Clearing/Tree Replacement, Earth Moving, Erosion and Sediment Control/Stabilization, and Maintenance (two years). Ms. Schumm suggested some potential questions the Commission may want to ask the contractors such as: similar work/projects; timeframe; and comparable fees. She suggested the Commission look at each Request For Proposal for reading ease and if the directions were followed. Ms. Schumm stated that the Commission did not have to award the contract based on lowest bidder; however, any recommendation would have to be justified. She also stated that the Commission can pick and choose companies based on their proposals for different components of the overall project; however, the contractor could deny any request if asked to split their proposal and the dollar amount could be subject to change.

- Tallgrass Restoration

Doug DeWitt, Tallgrass Restoration Project Manager, thanked the Commission for the opportunity to present to them. Mr. DeWitt stated that Tallgrass has been in business since the late '90's and is a full service ecological restoration company. He stated that they do a variety of weed control, prescribed burning, installations, restoration, etc. Mr. DeWitt then opened the conversation to questions from the Commission.

Ms. Andrew stated that she did not see anything in the proposal regarding tree replacement. Mr. DeWitt stated that there were no specifics mentioned in the criteria and therefore he did not include anything in the proposal. He stated that they can definitely handle tree replacement; however, it would have to be something discussed in addition to their proposal. Vice Chairman Kalinowski asked if the people listed in their proposal would be the people working on the project. Mr. DeWitt stated that those people would be the core group primarily involved. He stated that they have some seasonal employees, but they would be under the direction and observed by the core people listed. Ms. Andrew asked if they would be renting any of the equipment they plan to use. Mr. DeWitt stated that they own everything they would use for this project. Vice Chairman Kalinowski asked if soil would be taken offsite. Mr. DeWitt responded that any debris that was not natural and could not be reused would be taken offsite. Ms. Schumm stated that soil is designed to be reused by all of the companies presenting tonight. Vice Chairman Kalinowski asked how he expected to handle certain portions of the project where his company could encounter up to 80 foot drops in the ravine. Mr. DeWitt stated that those sections would be done by hand and would have to be looked at more closely. He also stated that there are some things listed in their proposal that would have to be discussed in more detail as the specs weren't very specific, such as a line item titled "repair disturbed areas C125." Ms. Andrew asked if he had walked the site, to which Mr. DeWitt stated he had about one month ago. Vice Chairman Kalinowski then asked if Tallgrass had liability insurance for everyone working on this project. Mr. DeWitt stated that they did and Ms. Schumm stated that having their own insurance is a part of the project's requirements. Ms. Schumm then stated that the property where the dam is location is an additional \$10,000- \$15,000 that is not included in the budget she gave the Commission. She stated that it will be a supplemental part of the project that will part of the match but not part of the Village

costs. Vice Chairman Kalinowski finished the questioning segment by asking what the most common compliment was and the most common problematic comment the company has received from clients. Mr. DeWitt stated that the company takes pride in being proactive to reduce any problematic comments and works with clients in a timely manner. The Commission thanked Mr. DeWitt for his time.

- **Davey Resource Group**

Irma Terry, Project Manager, along with Nicky Obenauf, Project Manager/Field Coordinator, of Davey Resource Group and Charlie Keppel, Coordinator, from The Care of Trees came to present to the Commission. Ms. Terry stated that Davey Resource Group was established in 1992 in Kent, Ohio. She also stated that in the summer of 2008, The Davey Tree Expert Company merged with The Care of Trees which now operated as a wholly owned Davey subsidiary. It was stated that they are only bidding on the 1st, 3rd, and 4th components of the project. Before opening the floor for questions from the Commission, it was also stated that cost saving measures had already been taken such as using the NAG-S75, a specific lower cost erosion control fabric, as well as planting 5-gallon container stock trees instead of the 2 inch diameter trees specified in the Request for Proposal. The cost listed for the trees includes the cost of the tree, installation, deer fencing, and an estimated 2 hours of labor per tree. All trees would come from Illinois based companies.

Vice Chairman Kalinowski asked Davey, if they were to receive the recommendation for components 1, 3, and 4 of the project how would they handle the scheduling with whatever other company filled in component 2. Davey stated that communication would be key. They stated that their biggest concern would be the timing between the earth moving and the seed laying, so they would be diligent about communication. Ms. Andrew asked if they would consider negotiating the pricing on estimated cost of tree removal for those listed as "additional trees." Mr. Kepper responded that it would depend on the size of the tree and that the costs listed were averaged from many different sizes of trees. Ms. Andrew asked if they would be burning or chipping the trees once they were removed. Mr. Kepper stated that they would either chip or take offsite. He stated that burning was not preferable as it was highly dependent upon the weather and that they were also in close proximity to houses. Ms. Andrew then stated that some areas may be difficult to access with hauling equipment and asked when they walked the project site. Mr. Kepper stated that the site was walked about 4 weeks ago and a small tractor would be used to pull out trees to a clearer section and would then be chipped. Vice Chairman Kalinowski asked if the people listed on the proposal would be those working on the project and if those people had done case work similar to this in the past. Davey stated that the people listed on the proposal would be those working on the projects and that all had worked on similar projects in the past. Vice Chairman Kalinowski then asked if any subcontractors not directly employed by Davey Resources would be used, to which they answered "no."

The timer rang noting that the presentation time had elapsed.

- **Integrated Lakes Management**

Kara DeGraff, Project Manager, and Kim Blaszcack, Monitoring, Maintenance, Burn, came to present for Integrated Lakes Management (ILM). Ms. DeGraff began the presentation stating that ILM currently does maintenance on different sites along Flint Creek as well as the water quality testing. She stated that their bid was for the seeding/planting and maintenance portion only. She also stated that they were very familiar with the area as they have been employed by the Village since February of 2010.

Ms. Andrew asked Ms. DeGraff to specify what kind of work they have been doing to maintain the sites along Flint Creek. Ms. DeGraff stated that they come out three times during the growing season and do maintenance such as hand pulling, mowing, woody removal, and prescribed burnings. Ms. Andrew then stated that many trees have fallen into the creek and asked whether their removal was part of the maintenance contract. Ms. DeGraff stated that they do not take large deadfall out as there are benefits to leaving it there and it is not part of the maintenance agreement. Vice Chairman Kalinowski asked why they only had plans for seeding and plugs and did not include tree planting. Ms. DeGraff stated that in the specs, tree planting seemed to be more closely associated with the first portion of the project, tree removal/tree planting, and they were not bidding on that part of the project. Vice Chairman Kalinowski then asked about the schedule, since they were bidding on only a few components of the project. Ms. DeGraff stated that they would be working closely with the other company(s) doing the other portions of the project. She stated that seeding is critical and while they prefer to seed in the fall and plant in the spring, it can be done opposite as well. Vice Chairman Kalinowski asked if there was a guarantee on the plantings. Ms. DeGraff stated that, based on the maintenance benchmarks, the seed and plug guarantees would be met and replacement is included in their cost. Chairman Kramper stated that there were two different types of seeding mixtures in the proposal, one being powder and one being granular. Ms. DeGraff stated that the specs looked like a granular product should be used; however, ILM does not usually use this type of product and instead use a powder. She stated that they have great results with the powder with a much lower overall cost. She did state that a granular mixture could be used if necessary. Chairman Kramper asked if the matting used followed a similar philosophy. Ms. DeGraff stated that some portions of the stream would be more prone to flash floods and heavier matting would be used, such as C-125.

The timer rang noting that the presentation time had elapsed.

- Front Range Environmental

Marcy Barrett, National Sales Manager, gave the presentation for Front Range Environmental. She stated that Front Range is an eight year old company and handles projects such as storm water inspection and maintenance. Ms. Barrett stated that they would be bidding on components 1, 2, and 3 of the project. She stated that the only component that was a stand-alone price was number 2. It was also stated that Front Range would be contracting with other companies for components 1 and 3, and that the tree re-planting can be bid out if desired.

Vice Chairman Kalinowski asked if there was any guarantee regarding the hardscape being placed. Ms. Barrett stated that it has been historically effective. Vice Chairman Kalinowski then asked if both sites had been walked. Ms. Barrett stated that all areas, with the exception of the small area around the ravine, had been walked and a visual was performed at the ravine area. Vice Chairman Kalinowski questioned how they planned to get their equipment into the area. Ms. Barrett stated that they would attempt to use the least invasive approach and would use equipment appropriate for the terrain. She stated that there would be a significant amount of earth moving involved and the soil would be reused. Ms. Andrew asked where Front Range was located. Ms. Barrett stated that they are a company based out of McHenry. Ms. Andrew then asked who Front Range would prefer to contract with for the tree work. Ms. Barrett stated that they would use Midwest or Homer Tree Service out of Wauconda. There would be some staging involved and anything natural that could be reused would be. Ms. Barrett also stated that some things would be left in place if they were thought to add stabilization or benefits to the area. Chairman Kramper asked if Front Range would be handling the planting/seeding. Ms. Barrett stated that they would be as they feel that this should be “buttoned up” as the work continues. Vice

Chairman Kalinowski asked if Front Range had any soil specialist or engineer on staff. Ms. Barrett stated that they did, Brian Baumgartner who is the Director of Construction and Operations for the Midwest. Ms. Schumm asked if their quote for component two included seeding. Ms. Barrett stated that it did not and that they would be getting their seeds from a source that they use often.

- **ENcap**

Jonathan Koepke, Vice President, General Manager gave the presentation for ENcap. He stated that ENcap is bidding on all four components and immediately offered the floor to questions.

Ms. Andrew asked if everyone working on the project would be from Sycamore. Mr. Koepke stated that everyone from ENcap would be coming from Sycamore but there were some subcontractors that were not. He stated that Clean Cut Tree Service is from Lake Villa and Travis Schultz, Schultz Enterprises (grading/rock placement) is from Burlington, IL. Vice Chairman Kalinowski asked if everyone listed as part of the project team would be present on site. Mr. Koepke stated that at one point or another everyone listed as part of the project team would be onsite. Ms. Andrew asked for specification on price of tree replacement. Mr. Koepke stated that the price is separately listed to reflect the unit price per 2" native tree planted with a one year guarantee at \$265 per tree. He stated that they would most likely be balled and bur lapped. Vice Chairman Kalinowski asked if they would have a problem switching to 5-gallons container trees to which Mr. Koepke stated they would not. Ms. Andrew asked if the project site had been walked by their team. Mr. Koepke stated that Kelsey Musich, the Project Manager, did an onsite walk with Ms. Schumm. Ms. Andrew asked if it was thought that some parts would be difficult to access and how they would handle the challenges. Mr. Koepke stated that there were some difficult access points; however, they have done similar projects with similar challenges and he felt confident that ENcap could handle these areas without problem. Vice Chairman Kalinowski asked if the prices listed in the bid account for those challenges. Mr. Koepke stated that they do. Ms. Andrew asked if he thought large rocks would have to be wheel barrowed in to which Mr. Koepke stated that they would not. Ms. Andrew then asked how close their cost estimate usually is to the actual cost and if actual costs ever exceed the estimated costs. Mr. Koepke stated that they are almost always on target and less than 1% of the time do they exceed their estimated costs. Vice Chairman Kalinowski asked if there was a guarantee on the earth moving portion since some areas are subject to flash flooding and other similar problems. Mr. Koepke stated that any issue that would arise would be covered in their maintenance portion, but he is confident that there would not be any problems based on the materials selected. Ms. Andrew asked if there was a plan to deal with the trees that had already fallen into the creek. Mr. Koepke stated that those would be removed. Chairman Kramper asked if there were any pictures in the proposal that showed similar stone to the type they would be using in Flint Creek. Mr. Koepke stated that they would be using limestone, not a rounded cobblestone, and some examples were the pictures from Bowes Creek, Rockford and Windings.

The timer rang noting that the presentation time had elapsed.

- **V-3**

Tom Foster, Senior Estimator, and Keith Jones, Restoration Site Manager, gave the presentation for V-3. Mr. Foster stated that they were bidding on components 2, 3, and 4. It was also stated that they were not bidding on the first component because they noticed a lot of downed trees and they are more comfortable with selective tree clearing.

Vice Chairman Kalinowski started the questioning by asking if all the staff listed in the proposal would be onsite. Mr. Jones responded that all construction work would be done by V-3 and that they do not use subcontractors. He stated that the staff listed would be onsite and that they would also have the expertise to modify the plans if needed. Vice Chairman Kalinowski asked what their maintenance plan included. Mr. Jones stated that it was strictly in regarding to plant material. He stated that they do not usually have any problems with their materials, but if one arises they would work with the Village for viable solutions in the field. Vice Chairman Kalinowski then asked if engineers would be used and if they had walked the site. Mr. Jones and Mr. Foster both stated that V-3 has many engineers that will aide with the project. It was also stated that the site had been walked. Vice Chairman Kalinowski asked if they thought there would be challenges with the terrain. Mr. Jones stated that V-3 has done a wide range of projects and that they are confident in their abilities; however, a lot will be weather dependent. Mr. Foster explained to the Commission that their prices were quantity based prices and that the schedule of values is a starting point.

The timer rang noting that the presentation time had elapsed.

- Applied Ecological Services

Josh LaPointe, Project Director, and Chuck Campbell, Project Estimator, were present to give the Applied Ecological Services (AES) presentation. Mr. LaPointe stated that Applied Ecological Services uses a unique ecological approach to projects and they would be bidding on all four components. Mr. LaPointe also stated that their proposal is to include the use of bendway weirs to direct the water away from the walls of the stream banks and decrease velocity. Mr. Campbell stated that descriptions as well as illustrations were to be included the proposal; however, had been mistakenly excluded.

Vice Chairman Kalinowski asked if there was any type of guarantee that items used, such as bendway weirs, would be fixed if problems (mechanical or engineering) arose. Mr. LaPointe stated that any problems that arose during the maintenance period would be guaranteed. Vice Chairman Kalinowski asked for clarification on the maintenance. Mr. LaPointe stated that it would include plantings and hardware. Ms. Andrew asked if AES planned to outsource any tree work and how they planned to remove the necessary trees. Mr. LaPointe stated that they would not be outsourcing any tree work and that they would most likely heavily rely on chipping or haul offsite very large trees. Ms. Andrew asked if any of the plausible large trees would be banked on the sides of the stream and used for stabilization, rather than being completely removed from the site. Mr. LaPointe stated that, where it made sense, they would definitely use that tactic. Vice Chairman Kalinowski asked why the tree work seemed to be separate from the rest of the bid. Mr. LaPointe stated that the direction on the Request for Proposal asked for separation. He also stated that those are prices for 5 gallon trees in ground and with protection which varied slightly from the original project guidelines. Mr. LaPointe then stated that a major question they have regards the Lake County Stormwater Commission and how they will allow the project to be done. Ms. Andrew asked how often the bids given to clients are close to the actual costs. Mr. Campbell stated that whether they are close or overshoot that AES stands by their bids. It was also stated that schematics of the bendway weirs would be emailed to Ms. Schumm for distribution to any interested Commission member.

The timer rang noting that the presentation time had elapsed.

The Commission thanked each of the contractors for their time and presentations. After all of the contractors had exited the building the Commission began their discussion. Ms. Schumm stated that the Lake County Stormwater Commission already had a copy of the plans for the project and that there

were no major changes required. Chairman Kramper stated that he did not feel as if there was much difference whether a company had many engineers on staff, in the field, etc. or not. Ms. Schumm stated that every company that presented tonight was a reputable company. Ms. Andrew stated that ENcap was the only company who put their hourly pay specific to the different jobs being handled. Therefore each position had a specific hourly wage that was clearly displayed and was consistent throughout the proposal. The Commission also stated that they felt as if ENcap had a good understanding of how the grant worked and would be broken down throughout the project. Chairman Kramper asked the rest of the Commission if they had any worry about going with a company that didn't have many engineers. The Commission stated they did not. Ms. Schumm stated that Lake County Stormwater Management would be overseeing the project anyway and that they have a lot of engineers. Vice Chairman Kalinowski asked if it is bad to chip trees and then leave them along the area. Ms. Schumm stated that it isn't something that she wants to see happen.

Vice Chairman Kalinowski asked if anything had been secured from residents regarding access to the stream, etc. Ms. Schumm stated that a company would need to be picked first. That way, when approaching the residents, they would know the specific plans and would be able to tell each household what would be needed. She also noted that this project is only two weeks. She stated that there would not need to be a lot of staging and that there wouldn't be a lot of equipment sitting anywhere for very long. Vice Chairman Kalinowski clarified that there had only been one meeting with any information for property owners and that no one had agreed to anything specific. Ms. Schumm stated that as soon as a contractor was chosen, and a better idea of what was needed had been obtained, each property owner would be contacted.

Chairman Kramper stated that he would like a recommendation to be made at this time. He suggested that all of the companies with extremely high bids be eliminated as he does not see why there is so much difference between them and other companies with lower bids. Ms. Andrew stated that she liked ENcap, and Chairman Kramper seconded her opinion. Vice Chairman Kalinowski abstained from all conversation since her property will be directly affected. Ms. Schumm reminded the Commission that they were given scoring sheets to use. The Commission agreed that they did not require the use of scoring sheets as they all agreed on the decision and felt as if all of the companies were so different they were unable to fairly compare them against each other. It was also stated that ENcap had the lowest bid, would be managing the entire project, had good explanations, and a great presentation.

Motion: Jackie Andrew moved not to score the contractors based upon the scoring sheets given due to the fact that she thought it was impertinent because each contractor was completely different and could not be compared to each other; seconded by Chairman Bruce Kramper.

Discussion: There was some discussion.

| | | |
|------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u>Vote on Motion:</u> | <u>Ayes:</u> | Chairman Bruce Kramper, Jackie Andrew |
| | <u>Nays:</u> | None |
| | <u>Abstain:</u> | Vice Chairman Patty Kalinowski |
| | <u>Absent:</u> | Rob Haas |

Chairman Kramper declared the motion approved.

The Commission also agreed that whichever contractor was to be selected should work closely with Village Forester Susan Allman regarding tree work.

Motion: Jackie Andrew moved that the selected contractor work with Susan Allman, Village Forester, on work relating to tree removal and replanting; seconded by Vice Chairman Patty Kalinowski.

Discussion: There was some discussion.

Vote on Motion:

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| <u>Ayes:</u> | Chairman Bruce Kramper, Jackie Andrew, Vice Chairman Patty Kalinowski |
| <u>Nays:</u> | None |
| <u>Abstain:</u> | None |
| <u>Absent:</u> | Rob Haas |

Chairman Kramper declared the motion approved.

Motion: Jackie Andrew moved to recommend the Village Board award the Flint Creek Restoration contract to ENcap to handle all four components of the Flint Creek project based upon their low bid, necessary qualifications and experience, and a good presentation; seconded by Chairman Bruce Kramper.

Discussion: There was some discussion.

Vote on Motion:

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u>Ayes:</u> | Chairman Bruce Kramper, Jackie Andrew |
| <u>Nays:</u> | None |
| <u>Abstain:</u> | Vice Chairman Patty Kalinowski |
| <u>Absent:</u> | Rob Haas |

Chairman Kramper declared the motion approved and recommendation made to the Village Board.

Ms. Schumm stated that ENcap is a very qualified company and that they were also one of the only ones that had any educational aspects listed. She stated that they will use this project as an example in the future and that the Village should be very excited to have them do the work.

4. Old/New Business

Vice Chairman Kalinowski asked that the Commission consider changing any meeting dates for the future year's schedule so that they will not have a meeting on any election day.

Susan Allman, Village Forester, stated that she has begun the process of applying for Tree City Status. She stated that the process is ongoing and that she will keep the Commission updated as it continues.

5. Adjournment

Motion: Jackie Andrew moved the Meeting be adjourned; seconded by Vice Chairman Patty Kalinowski.

Discussion: There was no discussion.

Vote on Motion: The voice vote was unanimous in favor.

At 9:35 p.m. Chairman Bruce Kramper declared the meeting adjourned.

These Minutes were approved at the Environmental and Health Commission Meeting held February 5, 2013.

ATTEST:

_____, Nicole Keiter, Deputy Village Clerk